

**REMARKS**

On July 28, 2005, an Amendment After Final Office Action was submitted in response to the Final Office Action, mailed April 27, 2005. Pursuant to the Examiner's Advisory Action, mailed August 10, 2005, the Amendments After Final were not entered by the Examiner. Therefore, the instant amendments and remarks are submitted accompanying a Request for Continued Examination in response to the Final Office Action, mailed April 27, 2005.

Upon entry of the amendments herein, claims 1-21 and 23 have been amended. Claims 24 and 25 have been added. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-25 are pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested.

**A. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pub No. 2003/0097361 A1 by Huang et al. ("Huang") in view of Barnes, Kate, "10 Minute Guide to Windows 3.1" ("Barnes"). Applicant disagrees with the rejections set forth by the Examiner. However, solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, one or more of the claims have been amended to clarify distinctions between Huang and Applicant's claimed invention.

**i. HYPERLINK TO THE DOCUMENT ASSOCIATED WITH AN ENTRY**

Independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 23 have been amended to clarify that a list is created that includes a hyperlink to the document associated with a selected entry. From the claims as amended, it is clear to one having ordinary skill in the art that the hyperlink of the claimed invention is a hyperlink back to the actual original document that is associated with the selected entry. As such, a user who uses the hyperlink of the claimed invention may be granted access to the original document associated with the entry. Accordingly, if the original document is updated or otherwise altered after creation of the list, the hyperlink in the list of the claimed invention would grant the user access to the altered version of the original document.

The portions of Huang cited by the Examiner, at best, disclose a hyperlink to a copy of a document that has been selected for attachment to an email, that copy being created at the time the copy is attached to the email. This is not a hyperlink to the original document itself. Thus, if the original document associated with the entry were updated or otherwise altered after creation

of the list, a user accessing the hyperlink disclosed in the portions of Huang cited by the Examiner would be brought to the document as it existed when attached to the email, not the updated or altered original document. Neither Huang nor Barnes, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest at least this feature of amended claims 1, 8, 15, and 23. Support for these amendments exists in the as-filed specification. Thus, no new matter is added by these amendments.

ii. A REUSABLE LIST

Claims 1, 8, 15, and 23 have also been amended to clarify that the list created and stored in a system clipboard according to the claimed invention may be re-used, by virtue of its storage in the system clipboard. The portions of Huang cited by the Examiner, at best, disclose an email with attached documents that can be sent to another user, not a list that can be stored in clipboard and *reused*. See Huang, paragraph 0084. There is no teaching or suggestion in the portions of Huang cited by the Examiner, that the email is a *reusable* list that is stored in a system clipboard. Barnes does not cure this deficiency. Neither Huang nor Barnes, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest at least this feature of amended claims 1, 8, 15, and 23. Applicants believe that a person having ordinary skill in the art would find at least implicit support for these amendments in the as-filed specification. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added by these amendments.

iii. A LIST THAT CAN BE PASTED INTO ONE OR MORE DOCUMENTS OR TRANSFERRED TO PROGRAMS OTHER THAN THE PROGRAM THAT DISPLAYS THE SUMMARY VIEW

Claims 1, 8, 15, and 23 have also been amended to clarify that the list created according to the claimed invention may be pasted into one or more documents or transferred to programs other than, or in addition to, the program that displays the summary view. The portions of Huang cited by the Examiner at best, disclose documents attached to an email that may be sent to another user. The email of Huang cannot be pasted into one or more documents or transferred to other programs. Barnes does not cure this deficiency. Neither Huang nor Barnes, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest at least this feature of claims 1, 8, 15, and 23. Support for these amendments exists in the as-filed specification. Thus no new matter is added by these amendments.

iv. SELECTION OF ENTRIES

The Examiner asserts that Barnes supplies teaching of the use of a clipboard sufficient to meet one or more of the features of the invention in claims 1, 8, 15, and 23. However, fundamental differences exist between the portions of Barnes cited by the Examiner and the applicants claimed invention, such that the Examiner's citations to Barnes fail to supply the necessary features of the claimed invention.

For Example, claims 1, 8, 15, and 23, as amended, recite that a user may select one or more of the entries from the summary view to create a list that is then stored in a system clipboard. The portions of Barnes cited by the Examiner, at best, teach that text can be selected for a clipboard by placing a pointer before the first character of text to be selected and dragging the pointer to the last character of text to be selected (e.g., only contiguous text may be placed on the clipboard as one item). See Barnes pgs 60-62. Thus, according to Barnes, a user cannot select non-contiguous items and place them into one aggregated list on the clipboard. However, the claimed invention enables the user to select one or more items in a summary view, these items need not be contiguous text in the summary view to be placed a single list that is stored in the clipboard. See Specification FIGS. 3 and 4. The claims reflect this distinction. As such, neither Barnes nor Huang, either alone or in combination, teach, or suggest at least this feature of claims 1, 8, 15, and 23.

For at least the reasons set forth herein, neither Huang nor Barnes, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1, 8, 15, 23, or 24, as amended. Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-22, and 25 are allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims, as well as for the further limitations they contain. Accordingly, withdrawal of the pending rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending rejections, and indicate the allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

By: 

Timothy C. Rooney

Registration No. 55,878

Tel. No. (703) 905-2239

Date: August 29, 2005

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2000 (Telephone)  
(703) 905-2500 (Facsimile)

**CUSTOMER NO. 00909**